VIII. Transportation-Land Use Options

The second largest source of Utah's gross GHG emissions is the transportation sector, accounting for 25 percent in 2005.[1]

Options include:

[1] Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Reference Case Projections, 1990-2020; Center for Climate Strategies, February 2007 http://www.deq.utah.gov/BRAC_Climate/docs/Final_Utah_GHG_I&F_Report_3-29-07.pdf]

TL-1 – Develop and Implement Aggressive Mass Transit Strategy

Benefit/Cost of Reducing CO_2e:

New Mexico: 13.4 MMt between 2007-2020; 1.3% of 2020 emissions; $0 cost or net savings
N. Carolina: 31.3 MMt between 2007-2020; 1.1% of 2020 emissions; $0 cost or net savings

Assessment: High Priority. Bin B.

This policy option has the potential to significantly reduce GHG emissions and provide important co-benefits, but will require a concerted, long-term effort to implement.

Mass transit is included in long-range planning for the Wasatch Front. However the plans should be more aggressive and need to be fully-integrated and supported with adequate funding. Transit also offers important co-benefits such as improving air quality and congestion mitigation. Public support of the 2006 transit initiatives was high.

This is a long-term strategy needs to be developed in conjunction with quality growth land-use planning principles. To ensure success, mass transit options need to be convenient, reliable, and affordable. The strategy should consider the following program options:

- Methods for expanding government programs such as the UTA Eco-pass
- Educating the general public about transit options
- State and local incentives for increased utilization of mass transit.
- Optimized fares and enhanced subsidies are needed to encourage an optimal ridership rate; a detailed analysis should be undertaken to determine the optimum rates for daily fare and monthly passes.[2]
- The State could assist with obtaining rights-of-way, park and ride lots, and traffic signal priority.
- Options that compliment mass transit, including shared ownership vehicles (e.g. Zipcars/Freedom cars), bike carriers, and pedestrian-friendly city planning, should be evaluated in long range plans.

[2] Current fare rates can create barriers to transit ridership. For example, it costs $12.00 for a family of four to take a round trip downtown by bus, remaining cheaper to drive an automobile. Approximately 16 percent of UTA operating expenses come from passengers fares.

TL-2 - Quality Growth Program

Benefit/Cost of Reducing CO_2e:

Arizona: 26.7 MMt between 2007-2020; 2.4% of 2020 emissions; $0 cost
New Mexico: 13.4 MMt between 2007-2020; 1.3% of 2020 emissions; $0 cost
Montana: 0.26 MMt between 2007-2020; 0.1% of 2020 emissions; N/A
Oregon: 0.4 MMt between 2007-2025; 0.4% of 2025 emissions; Cost effective
N. Carolina: 50.3 MMt between 2007-2020; 3% of 2020 emissions; net savings

Assessment: High Priority. Bin A.

This policy option could substantially reduce GHG emissions in the State, but is a longer-term option that will require significant effort to implement. BRAC members noted the State could help facilitate these collaborative processes with resources and funding.

In Utah, 80% of the population lives along the rapidly growing Wasatch Front region. Smart growth is a vital component to any strategy that seeks to reduce CO_2 emissions from transportation. The State of Utah should promote smart growth, including such community and transportation planning measures as compact, transit-oriented, walkable, bicycle-friendly planning, as well as mixed-use development with a range of housing choices. Such measures help reduce GHG emissions through a reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Congestion management is also important. Envision Utah and the Wasatch Front Regional Council should be consulted as guides for this policy option. An effective strategy should also include public education and could include incentives to ensure the uptake of these measures.

Envision Utah recently released the findings of its Wasatch Choices 2040 Project, including a Vision Scenario that reflects the preferences of participants in a visioning process that involved 1,000 area residents. The Vision Scenario steers 13% of new development (compared with 4% in a business-as-usual scenario) into walkable, mixed-use districts,[3] like those under development in Kennecott Land's new Daybreak community. Envision Utah's modeling results show a modest but measurable reduction in VMT in the Vision Scenario relative to business-as-usual.

[3] Envision Utah, *Wasatch Choices 2040*. 2007

TL-4 - Trip Reduction, Rideshare, Vanpool, Telecommuting

Benefit/Cost of Reducing CO_2e:

N/A

Assessment: High Priority. Bin A.

The current Commuter Trip Reduction Program could be enhanced to provide larger GHC and air quality benefits over the longer run. The challenge with these types of programs is the ability to meet employees' diverse and changeable needs. Additional information is required to determine the GHC emissions reductions of this option.

UTA Rideshare currently provides marketing and promotion to eligible public and private enterprises for the following programs: teleworking, vanpool, guaranteed ride home, commuter choice, discount pass programs, carpool, bicycle, alternative work hours. These travel demand management measures are aimed at reducing commuter vehicle miles traveled during the peak travel periods, thereby reducing fuel consumption and GHG emissions. Enhancement of the existing program could achieve greater GHG emissions reduction benefits. In addition, the rapid and ongoing expansion and adoption of internet and telecommunications technologies may enhance opportunities for telecommuting over the longer run. Efforts taken by the State to help accelerate the deployment and acceptance of these technologies may yield additional GHG reduction benefits.

TL-6 – "Buy Local" Program

Benefit/Cost of Reducing CO_2e:

New Mexico: 5.9 MMt between 2007-2020; 1.1% of 2020 emissions; $0.2/ton

Assessment: Medium Priority. Bin B.

This policy option could yield GHG emissions benefits and could help support Utah's economy. However, additional research is required to determine the optimal form of such a policy and to assess its cost effectiveness. There may be a point where such a program is counterproductive – for example, tomatoes from a local hothouse may be more energy consumptive than trucking tomatoes from Arizona. Also, there may be the unintended consequence: If every state implements a "buy local" program, what happens to the economic sectors where Utah most exports goods?

The goal of "buy local" programs is to reduce vehicle miles traveled and associated GHG emissions through the encouragement of consumers to buy locally-produced goods. Such programs can include both incentives and consumer education. An important co-benefit of a "buy local" program is the support it lends the statewide economy.

TL-7 - Promote Low-Carbon Fuels and Vehicle Technologies (Statewide)

Benefit/Cost of reducing CO_2e:

Arizona: 6.2 MMt between 2007-2020; 0.7% of 2020 emissions; $0 cost
New Mexico: 9.1 MMt between 2007-2020; 1.7% of 2020 emissions; $-13/ton
Oregon: 1 MMt between 2007-2025; 1% of 2025 emissions; Cost effective
N. Carolina: 25.8 MMt between 2007-2020; 1.2% of 2020 emissions; N/A

Assessment: High Priority. Bin A.

This policy option could result in significant GHG reduction benefits. Some incentive programs are already in place in Utah, although they should be refined and expanded to extend GHG reduction and other benefits.

The State of Utah should promote low-carbon fuels and vehicle technologies. Examples could include low-carbon biofuels and other alternative fuels, hybrid, and plug-in vehicles. Incentives could include tax credits, HOV lane access, and parking advantages. Right sizing vehicles and vehicle fleets are also important methods to reduce carbon emissions from the automobile fleet statewide. For biofuels, fuel quality and related vehicle warranty issues should be addressed.

Currently in Utah, a tax credit and grant loan program exists for vehicles that utilize alternative fuels. This program provides incentives for natural gas and flex-fuel vehicles, but does not provide an incentive for off-the-shelf, market-ready high efficiency technology. Incentives should be fuel and technology neutral. Readily available technologies reduce GHG emissions through improved fuel efficiency through variable valve timing, cylinder deactivation, efficient transmissions, as well as hybrid drives and natural gas and cleaner diesel fuels.

A similar example being proposed on the national level is the OILSAVE Act recently proposed by Utah Senator Robert Bennett. The OILSAVE Act takes a technology-neutral approach and allows any vehicle with superior fuel efficiency to qualify for a credit, whether it uses hybrid or conventional technologies. Vehicles that are at least 25 percent more fuel efficient than the applicable CAFÉ standard for cars, trucks and SUVs, will get a tax credit of at least $630 and as much as $1860 for the most fuel efficient models. The consumer could claim the tax credit on his or her tax return or transfer it to an auto dealer – providing a “cash back” option to consumers at the time of purchase.

TL-8 - State Fleet Lead by Example

Benefit/Cost of reducing CO_2e:

Arizona: 0.4 MMt between 2007-2020; $0 cost
Oregon: Cost effective

Assessment: High Priority. Bin A.

Although direct GHG reduction benefits are limited due to the small size of the State fleet relative to the total number of vehicles in Utah, this policy option demonstrates leadership by the State and can be readily implemented.

The State should lead by example in the purchase of low-carbon fuels and vehicle technologies. School district bus fleets offer an immediate opportunity to utilize these fuels and technologies, and implementation would have important air quality co-benefits for school children.

Refueling infrastructure limitations have made existing alternative fuel requirements for State fleets difficult to implement. Such limitations need to be addressed in concert with vehicle purchase decisions.

In addition to purchasing vehicles that use low-carbon fuels, the State should prioritize the purchase of vehicles with high efficiency technologies such as variable valve timing, efficient transmissions, and hybrid technologies. State fleets should "right-size" their vehicles, ensuring that the most fuel efficient vehicle is used for the task required.

In the 2007 Legislative session, HB110 created a set of state fleet efficiency requirements. This legislation is results-oriented, while being non-prescriptive in how departments and divisions achieve efficiency improvements. The options would include right-sizing, efficiency technologies, and alternative fuels.

TL-9 - Clean Car Program

Benefit/Cost of reducing CO_2e:

Arizona:	32.5 MMt between 2007-2020; 3.4% of 2020 emissions; -$90/ton
New Mexico:	10.4 MMt between 2007-2020; 1.9% of 2020 emissions; -$117/ton
Colorado:	14% reduction potential; -$100/ton
Montana:	5.2 MMt between 2007-2020; 2% of 2020 emissions; -$100/ton
Oregon:	6.24 MMt between 2007-2025; 6.5% of 2025 emissions; Cost effective
N. Carolina:	44.5 MMt between 2007-2020; 3% of 2020 emissions; -$100/ton

Assessment: High Priority. Bin B.

This policy option could substantially reduce GHG emissions in the State and result in a cost savings to consumers. However, this is a longer-term option that will require significant effort to implement. Central to this policy option is the adoption of clean car standards already recognized by California and 12 other states.[4] Doing so would mean that new vehicles sold in Utah by each manufacturer would need to, on average, be 30 percent more efficient by 2016.

There is a high CO_2 reduction potential, cost savings, and associated energy security and air quality benefits. Due to legal proceedings associated with this option, implementation may not be straightforward. However, in April 2007, the Supreme Court ruled that the EPA has the authority to regulate CO_2 emissions from automobiles. The waiver for this program implementation is currently being decided.

In studies conducted in several western states, the adoption of a clean car program[5] has consistently been ranked as one of the most cost-effective GHG emissions reduction strategies. This option was also found to have a large impact on total emissions, with projections ranging from 1.9 to 6.5 percent of total statewide emissions.

In the preliminary Utah Energy Efficiency Strategy analysis, this option is highly cost effective and yields very significant CO_2 reductions. The study found that savings in fuel costs over the lifetime of the projected eligible vehicles sold in Utah would equal about $1.41 billion (present value).[6] Assuming 2006 price levels, this gives a net economic benefit of $1.16 billion (2006 dollars) over the life of the vehicles purchased in 2009-2015.[7] There may be other important economic factors that are not reflected in these numbers. The study also found that if efficiency accounted entirely for the GHG emissions reductions, new vehicles would consume on average 22 percent less fuel in 2012, and 30 percent less fuel in 2016, than the average vehicle consumed in 2002. In addition, emissions of CO_2 could be reduced by 841,000 short tons in 2015 and by 1.86 million short tons in 2020, with additional upstream reductions.[8]

---

[4] These states are: California, Connecticut, Maine, Maryland Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington. States in which this program is being considered include Arizona, New Mexico, Minnesota, Nevada, Tennessee, and Texas.

[5] This program sets mandatory GHG emissions standards for light-duty vehicles and was enabled by California's AB1493

[6] This assumes an average15 year vehicle life, and that gasoline prices remain at their 2006 levels. This cost savings figure is likely conservative due to the likelihood of increasing fuel costs.

[7] The fuel savings exclude state gasoline tax (24.5 cents per gallon).

[8] Utah Energy Efficiency Strategy, preliminary results from review draft, June 2007

TL-10 - Idle-Reduction Program

Benefit/Cost of reducing CO_2e:
Arizona: 11.8 MMt between 2007-2020; 0.8% of 2020 emissions; -$22/ton
New Mexico: 6.3 MMt between 2007-2020; 0.7% of 2020 emissions; $4/ton
Montana: 0.093 MMt between 2007-2020
N. Carolina: 1.9 MMt between 2007-2020; 0.1% of 2020 emissions; -$22/ton

Assessment: High Priority. Bin B.

This policy option can result in GHG emissions reductions and has important air quality co-benefits, particularly for school-aged children. Although some components of this policy option, such as an educational campaign, can be readily implemented, other components such as truck stop electrification systems will require greater effort over a longer period of time. The Farm Bureau cautioned of potential "unintended consequences" for farming due to the possibility of few or no options for truck stop electrification in rural areas.

School buses, developing no-idle programs for public-sector buildings, and strategies for heavy-duty trucks should be the target for idle reduction programs. A school and school disctict program should be the priority due to the low cost, ease of implementation through district networks, high visibility, large impact, and significant co-benefits. Specific methods to reduce idling in the trucking industruy and at truck stops should be studied further due to varied settings and scenarios. Most of the idling for trucking occurs overnnight and at the loading/unloading point.

Preliminary results from a heavy-duty truck efficiency and idle reduction program and other efficiency measures analysed in the Utah Energy Efficiency Strategy found significant reductions of CO_2 (547,000 tons in 2020).[9]

Currently, Utah Clean Cities is working with the National Energy Foundation to develop an idle reduction education and training pilot program for bus drivers. Ten school districts in Utah and Nevada are currently participating in the program that will launch with the 2007-2008 school year. Utah Clean Cities is also working to introduce the program through national networks.

Other idle reduction resources include:

- The Utah Transit Authority (UTA), which uses block heaters and requires drivers to shut buses off after 10 minutes of idling.

- The Argonne National Laboratory Transportation Technology R&D Center, which has a program to help reduce vehicle idling, including an idle reduction calculator.[10]

- The Wasatch Front Regional Council, which has also allocated funding for idle reduction.

[9] Utah Energy Efficiency Strategy, preliminary results from review draft, June 2007
[10] http://www.transportation.anl.gov/research/technology_analysis/idling.html, http://www.transportation.anl.gov/downloads/idling_worksheet.xls

TL-11 - Vehicle Speed Reduction

Benefit/Cost of reducing CO_2e:

Arizona: 5.2 MMt between 2007-2020; 0.3% of 2020 emissions; $35/ton
New Mexico: 2.8 MMt between 2007-2020; 0.3% of 2020 emissions

Assessment: High Priority. Bin B.

While this policy option could result in GHG emissions reductions due to greater fuel efficiency, it is likely to be politically and technically difficult to implement. The cost of implementing this policy option could range from revenue neutral to high, depending on the policy components selected.

Due largely to aerodynamic drag, as vehicle speed increases, fuel efficiency is reduced. The speed at which fuel economy is highest varies, but is typically below 60 miles per hour for a light-duty vehicle.[11] Federal Highway Administration tests of nine vehicles in 1997 found that fuel economy declined on average by 3.1 percent when speed increased from 55 mph to 60 mph and by 8.2 percent increasing from 65 to 70 mph.[12]

A vehicle speed reduction policy option could include any of a handful of components, including, but not limited to enhanced enforcement of speed limits, reduced speed limits for commercial trucks, and other reduced speed limits. Recognizing the value of such strategies, the American Trucking Association supports a mandated national 68 mph speed limit for safety and fuel economy reasons.

The Utah Energy Efficiency Strategy analyzed the fuel saving potential associated with better enforcement of Utah's speed limits and found that CO_2 would be reduced by 198,000 short tons per year in 2015 and 218,000 short tons in 2020. The cost of this program would be wholly or largely paid for by increased revenue from speeding fines. Co-benefits resulting from enhanced enforcement of speed limits include: reduced likelihood that an accident will be fatal due to reduced speeds. NO_x emissions are also expected to decline with better enforcement of speed limits.

[11] "Drive more efficiently," U.S.DOE and U.S. EPA, http://www.fueleconomy.gov/feg/driveHabits.shtml.
[12] *Transportation Energy Data Book*, 2006. Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

TL-13 - Education Program

Benefit/Cost of reducing CO_2e:

N/A

Assessment: High Priority. Bin A.

Education is a critical enabling component to the entire suite of transportation and land use policy options listed in this section. Many educational programs exist and other can be implemented to improve awareness and efficacy of transportation options in Utah.

The State of Utah should develop and adequately fund education programs focusing on transportation, including, but not limted to vehicle choice, transit options, vehicle maintenance, driving habits/speeding/idling, and proper tire inflation.

TL-14 – Explore Funding Options for the Suite of Transportation and Land Use Options

Benefit/Cost of reducing CO_2e:

N/A

Assessment: High Priority. Bin B.

Adequate funding is a critical enabler to several of the transportation/land use policy options. Resolving funding issues will require a sustained and concerted effort by political leaders and stakeholders.

TL-15 – Develop Congestion Pricing Programs

Benefit/Cost of reducing CO_2e:

N/A

Assessment: Medium Priority. Bin A.

This policy option involves establishing congestion pricing to discourage vehicle use during peak times or along constrained transportation routes. Examples of such programs include toll roads, toll bridges, and high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes.

In September 2006, the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) began operation of the Utah Express Lanes program, a HOT lane congestion pricing program allowed by the passage of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) in 2005. Express Lanes program customers pay a monthly fee in exchange for HOT lane privileges. In the near future, this payment scheme will be replaced by a more sophisticated system that will provide customers real-time prices based on the level of congestion along the Express Lanes route. Those who opt to use the Express Lanes facility will be charged via a transponder device onboard their vehicle. UDOT estimates that it cost approximately $12.5 to initiate this program. Ongoing program expenses are offset with program revenues.

While such a program will likely yield peak and route congestion benefits, it is unclear whether it would result in robust GHG emissions reduction benefits. For example, drivers may simply opt to shift their travel to off-peak periods or may choose alternate routes. In either scenario, vehicle miles traveled would not necessarily decrease, and – as a result – GHG emissions would not be reduced. However, these programs could result in greater efficiency of the highway system and associated carbon benefits. As a result, careful program design is critical to the successful implementation of a congestion pricing program aimed at reducing GHG emissions.

Goals

The options discussed in this section include the following goals related to reducing GHG emissions through tranportation planning and effective land use.

Goal 1: Reduce distance traveled by:

a. Developing and implementing aggressive mass transit strategy (TL-1)
b. Developing and supporting quality growth programs (TL-2)
c. Encouraging trip reduction, rideshare, vanpool, telecommuting (TL-4)
d. Encouraging "buy local" programs (TL-6)
e. Adopting congestion pricing (TL-15)

Goal 2: Improve energy efficiency of travel by:

a. Developing and implementing aggressive mass transit strategy (TL-1)
b. Promoting low-carbon fuels and vehicle technologies (TL-7)
c. Leading by example with the State fleet (TL-8)
d. Adopting a Clean Car program (TL-9)
e. Implementing an idle-reduction program (TL-10)
f. Reducing vehicle speeds (TL-11)
g. Adopting congestion pricing (TL-15)

Goal 3: Reduce CO_2 emissions per unit of fuel consumed by:

a. Promoting low-carbon fuels and vehicle technologies (TL-7)
b. Leading by example with the State fleet (TL-8)

Goal 4: Adopt the following program enablers:

a. Education program (TL-13)
b. Funding for suite of options (TL-14)

Sorted by Priority:

#	Policy Option	Priority	Bin	Vote
TL-4	Trip Reduction, Rideshare, Vanpool, and Telecommuting	High	A	20
TL-7	Promote Low-Carbon Fuels and Vehicle Technologies (Statewide)	High	A	20
TL-8	State Fleet Lead by Example	High	A	19
TL-1	Develop and Implement Aggressive Mass Transit Strategy	High	B	19
TL-13	Education Program	High	A	18
TL-10	Idle-Reduction Program	High	B	18
TL-2	Quality Growth Program	High	A	17
TL-9	Clean Car Program	High	B	16
TL-11	Vehicle Speed Reduction	High	B	9
TL-14	Explore Funding Options for the Suite of Transportation and Land Use Options	High	B	9
TL-15	Congestion Pricing	Medium	A	19
TL-6	"Buy Local" Program	Medium	B	10

Sorted by Vote:

#	Policy Option	Priority	Bin	Vote
TL-4	Trip Reduction, Rideshare, Vanpool, and Telecommuting	High	A	20
TL-7	Promote Low-Carbon Fuels and Vehicle Technologies (Statewide)	High	A	20
TL-1	Develop and Implement Aggressive Mass Transit Strategy	High	B	19
TL-15	Congestion Pricing	Medium	A	19
TL-8	State Fleet Lead by Example	High	A	19
TL-10	Idle-Reduction Program	High	B	18
TL-13	Education Program	High	A	18
TL-2	Quality Growth Program	High	A	17
TL-9	Clean Car Program	High	B	16
TL-6	"Buy Local" Program	Medium	B	10
TL-11	Vehicle Speed Reduction	High	B	9
TL-14	Explore Funding Options for the Suite of Transportation and Land Use Options	High	B	9

Public Comment

Submitted by Bill Tibbitts, Anti-Hunger Action Committee on June 12, 2007

Dear Blue Ribbon Council on Climate Change:

The time is approaching when you will be asked to vote on final recommendations for initiatives to reduce carbon emissions in Utah. As the director of an organization that includes a large number of bus riders, it is very exciting to see that one of the recommendations coming from the Transportation Stakeholder Working Group is to Develop Mass Transit. It is important to develop the basic public transportation infrastructure to enable as many people as possible to leave their cars at home and use public transportation to get to work, school and other appointments. It is also a very positive thing to see that fare reduction is mentioned explicitly in that recommendation. It is my belief that the current price structure is a major barrier to participation in public transportation for many Utah families. For families that are larger than one or two people it is cheaper to buy and maintain a car than purchase monthly bus passes. A large family can spend over $20 to ride the bus to and from a movie. This discourages use of public transportation.

It seems to me that the recommendation for fare reduction needs to be made more explicit. I would suggest that the Council propose that price for bus service be reduced from the current rate of $1.50 to $1 and that the price of a monthly pass be reduced from $50 to $30. The number of passengers on UTA buses has been declining for several years.

The UTA Board recently voted to raise the price for bus fare to $2 over the next 19 months. If that increase is necessary to meet UTA's budget goals then it seems like the state could help them to make up the difference. Fare box revenue is a small part of UTA's total budget and so the costs for doing this would be cheaper than some of the other proposals being put before the Council. I believe that a significantly decreased price on a monthly pass would actually increase UTA's revenue. Right now you need to use a bus pass 34 times in a month to break even. This means only the most devoted users of public transportation purchase the pass. If a pass cost something closer to the price of riding 10-15 times then customers who currently ride 1-6 times to month would suddenly be tempted to purchase a monthly pass in a way that they currently are not.

Be that as it may, it is likely that the price increases that the UTA Board recently approved are not being driven by budget needs but are instead being driven by the belief of some some UTA Board members that people who ride the bus and TRAX should pay as much as possible for the costs of that service. The problem with that belief is that it assumes UTA's share of the transportation market is fixed. Right now over 19 people in Salt Lake County drive to work in a car alone for every one person who uses public transportation to get to work. With rising gas prices and all the current interest around local air quality and climate change. Many of those people would be more open to using public transportation if they were approached in the right way and the costs for public transportation were not also increasing.

Given the above, I would like to further suggest that you consider splitting the goal to "Develop mass transit" into two parts. The first part would be related to infrastructure, and could still be called "Develop mass transit". The second goal would deal with eliminating barriers people have to using public transportation and conducting the kind of social marketing necessary to convince people to give public transportation a chance. I guess this goal could be called, "Eliminate barriers and increase use

of existing mass transit." According to 2005 data from the Census Bureau, 17,500 people in Salt Lake County use public transportation to get to work. The state could play a very significant role in doubling that number by: a) promoting use of public transportation by state employees and firms that contract with the state, b) helping to decrease prices, as discussed above, and c) taking a leadership role in promoting the benefits of public transportation with the public.

Thank you for taking the time to serve on this important Council and thank you for taking the time to read through this overly wordy email. If you have any questions about any of the points that I have made please call me about them at 364-7765 ex 131.

Bill Tibbitts
Anti-Hunger Action Committee Director
347 South 400 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
(801)-364-7765 ex 131

Public Comment

Submitted by Jerry Costley, Executive Director of Disabled Rights Action Committee on July 6, 2007 via e-mail

I have received a copy of an email that Bill Tibbitts sent to you all encouraging you to look at specific reductions in UTA fares, and in particular the monthly passes as a means of encouraging individuals to use public transportation. I am writing in support of Mr. Tibbits statement. In Europe and other countries the use of public transportation is the norm. With lower fares and high costs of operating individual vehicles, most people commute via public transit. It is a great equalizer of transportation in that everyone, from the upper manager to the store clerk uses public transit. If we could create this kind of culture here we could cut back on a great number of emissions and greatly improve the quality of our air. Given the tremendous heat we have in the summer and the inversions we experience in the winter we are in desperate need of improved air quality. As it stands now, only those who are better off financially will be able to afford consistent bus ridership. Instead of trying to entice these and other individuals with slick ad campaigns, lets give them a financial offer they can't resist. Cutting fares to $1.00 a ride or $30.00 for a monthly pass would be much more irresistible than TV spots. In addition, it would have the added benefit of opening up transportation opportunities to a great many individuals who cannot now afford to leave their home.

On behalf of my many friends with the Disabled Rights Action Committee, I would like to request a reply and to know if you would support a significant UTA fare decrease such as Mr. Tibbits proposed as a means of encouraging increased ridership. Thank you for your work on behalf of a cleaner, healthier Utah. I look forward to hearing from you.

Jerry Costley
Executive Director
Disabled Rights Action Committee

Response by Senator Greg Bell on July 7, 2007, via e-mail:

Jerry, as you know the UTA Board makes these policy decisions. Elected officials certainly give input, but the board has the final say. This issue has certainly received a thorough airing, with wide public input and even protest. The ultimate changes were made in response to the public's frustration.

You and Bill raise a strategic issue--who is the market for bus ridership? Are we moving to a white collar commuter system, or are we seeking a broadly-based, affordable system? I have not had this dialogue with the UTA Board, but would be interested in hearing their perspective and will ask them to explain it to you, Bill, me and others interested. Thanks for your message. I look forward to more discussion on this important issue.

Greg Bell
Utah State Senate, District 22
gbell@utahsenate.org

Public Comment

Submitted by Dr. Richard Kanner, University of Utah Hospital and Clincs, via e-mail on July 11, 2007

My comment is that we need to make mass transit as acceptable as driving an automobile with only the driver in the car. We have a right of way for rail in Davis County but developers are now building the area up with low density housing, a situation that is bound to make mass transit a failure. Can something be done to ensure that we have high density housing, shopping malls and office buildings near the stations for the future mass transit lines? That will help convince people to use mass transit. Eastern cities, that are much more crowded than the Wasatch front all rely on mass transit and people use it even though it has to be subsidized by tax dollars. Here we say automobile traffic will double by 2020 and talk about building more roads so more cars can pollute more. We should be trying to reduce automobile traffic not double it. Auto exhaust adds to global warming, air pollution (both ozone and PM 2.5) and consumes a precious product. Mass transit, if convenient and affordable might entice people to get out of their cars. This requires long term planning, something that has been an anathema to the legislature. Thus, BRAC needs to try to convince the public and their elected representatives that we need long term planning that emphasizes mass transit with a decrease in automobile miles traveled. Thank you.

--

Richard E. Kanner, MD
University of Utah Hospitals and Clinics
26 North 1900 East
701 Wintrobe Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84132-4701
Tel: (801)581-7806
Fax: (801)585-3355
Beeper: (801)339-5592
Email: richard.kanner@hsc.utah.edu

Public Comment

Submitted by James Holtkamp, Holland and Hart, for Questar on August 16, 2007

Re: Questar comments on BRAC report

Dear Dr. Nielson:

On behalf of Questar, we offer the following comment on the Climate Change Work Group's report to the Governor's Blue Ribbon Advisory Commission on Climate Change. In particular, Questar suggests amplifying ES-18 and TL-7 as follows:

> It will take time for demand-side conservation measures and renewable energy to make a significant dent in Utah's energy mix. Natural gas is an abundant and clean source of energy. The emissions of CO2 per BTU of natural gas burned are significantly less than for other types of fossil fuels. Natural gas is already widely used for residential and commercial heating, generation of electricity and a variety of manufacturing processes. Natural gas is also used as a transportation fuel, particularly in mass transit, and increasing numbers of passenger vehicles are converting to use natural gas as fuel. In addition, the technology and infrastructure for producing, transporting and delivering natural gas is well-developed. Therefore, natural gas can make an immediate impact as a "bridge fuel" to a carbon-constrained energy future as we move toward more renewable energy sources and better technology to reduce and even eliminate carbon dioxide emissions from energy generation and use..
>
> Recommendation: Encourage and incentivize environmentally responsible development, production and use of natural gas. (ES-18; TL-7)

The foregoing recommendation was discussed at the Commission's August 14 meeting. We are submitting it in this letter for inclusion in the record of the Commission's deliberations.

Sincerely yours,

James A. Holtkamp
for Holland & Hart LLP

JAH:mf

cc: Thomas Jepperson
Ruland Gill